



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/053,626		01/24/2002	Kenji Fukuda	8001-1009	3592	
466	7590	08/09/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
YOUNG & THOMPSON				BAYERL, RAYMOND J		
745 SOUTH 2ND FLOO		TREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ARLINGTO	ON, VA	22202	ž.	2173	2173	
				DATE MAILED: 08/09/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

√ 2							
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/053,626	FUKUDA, KENJI					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Raymond J. Bayerl	2173					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence ad	dress				
THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.					
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the folloplaces the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complian time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendmer otice of Appeal (with appeal fee ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The rep	nt, affidavit, or other evide e) in compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or (3)				
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A		forth in the final rejection, w	hichavaris latar In				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHE! '06.07(f).	N THE FIRST REPLY WAS	FILED WITHIN				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b NOTICE OF APPEAL	stension and the corresponding am shortened statutory period for repl tr than three months after the maili	nount of the fee. The approp y originally set in the final Of	oriate extension fee ffice action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complishing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS.	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e	e)), to avoid dismissal of t	ths of the date of the appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	onsideration and/or search (see ow);	e NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or			the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ly rejected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		- OE A	(DTOL 004)				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		n-Compliant Amendmen	t (PTOL-324).				
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		rate, timely filed amendm	nent canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:	☑ will not be entered, or b) [vided below or appended.	will be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: 1 - 4, 6 - 9, 13 - 18. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	nd sufficient reasons why the a	ffidavit or other evidence	is necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under a ry and was not earlier presente	appeal and/or appellant f d.See 37 CFR 41.33(d)	ails to provide a (1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims at	ter entry is below or attac	ched.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the applicat	tion in condition for allowa	ance because:				

Applicant proposes no amendment to independent claim 18, so the 28 July 2005 response constitutes a request for

specifies a style that is later to be used for a file transmission from a server.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

reconsideration of the 35 USC 102 rejection of that claim. However, Ovadya (US #2001/0009008) continues to read upon a client device that returns display style information to the server "on accessing the server", since the claim does not stipulate that the transmission is in fact the first from the client to that server. Ovadya downloads style selection data from which the user

> RAYMOND J. BAYERL PRIMARY EXAMINER 4 August 2005 ART UNIT 2173

13. Other: _

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.

Part of Paper No. 20050804

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The proposal to amend independent claims 1, 13 such that the "terminals" store "display style information in a memory before first accessing the server" was not specifically considered prior to final rejection. The limitations previously presented were only that the terminals, at some time in the process, will store "display style information". Entry of the proposed amendment would necessitate substantial further consideration and/or search.